REMARKS

Claims 1-8 have been previously canceled and no claims have been added, amended or canceled by way of this response. Thus, claims 9-17 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

Response to Rejections Under Section 103:

Claims 9-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over Feddersen et al. (USPN 6,856,040) in view of Neupauer (USPN 4,873,619).

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner contends that Feddersen et al. teaches:

> …a generator regulation device (Figure 1) that regulates the generator having a **first and a second regulation unit that each operate on a rotor–winding side converter**, wherein **the first regulation unit is assigned to regulate a non-faulty 3-phase AC network and the second regulation unit is assigned to regulate the generator rotor winding**. [emphasis added]

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiners interpretation of Feddersen et al. and submit that Feddersen et al. merely teaches a single regulation unit **150** that isolates the wind turbine generator out-put, with respect to frequency, to allow above and below grid-frequency operation. The single regulation device of Feddersen et al. **150** comprises sub elements **151**, **152**, and **153** but they are merely sub components that perform the necessary AC to DC to AC conversion to allow the above and below grid-frequency operation.

Feddersen et al. does not teach "….a generator regulation device that regulates the generator having **a first and a second regulation unit that each operate on a rotor–winding side converter**, wherein the first regulation unit is assigned to regulate **a non-faulty 3-phase AC network** and the second regulation unit is assigned to regulate **the generator rotor winding**" as recited in claim 9. Furthermore, the single regulation unit **150** and sub components **151**, **152**, and **153** of Feddersen et al. do not distinguish between a faulty and "**a non-faulty 3-phase AC network**" as recited in claim 9. In addition to the above, Neupauer fails to teach the missing elements identified above.

In light of the above, Applicant's respectfully submit that the combination of Feddersen et al. in view of Neupauer does not teach or suggest Applicants claimed invention, therefore the section 103 rejection must fail. Furthermore, claims 10-17 are also patentable at least based on

their dependence from claim 9 as well as based on their own merits. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the Section 103 rejections and request the Examiner timely pass the application to allowance.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/15/08

By: _____

John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830